IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

AARON PFLUEGER,

Plaintiff,

4:17-CV-3092

vs.

ORDER

CREDIT BUREAU SERVICES, INC. and AMANDA BARRON.

Defendants.

The defendants filed a motion for partial reconsideration (filing 57) of the Court's order (filing 56) denying the defendants' motion for summary judgment (filing 43) regarding their claim to the bona fide error defense (15 U.S.C. § 1692k(c)).

But it is well-settled that motions to reconsider serve a limited function: to correct manifest errors of law or fact, or to present newly discovered evidence. Arnold v. ADT Sec. Servs., Inc., 627 F.3d 716, 721 (8th Cir. 2010); Zhai v. Cent. Ne. Orthopedics & Sports Med., P.C., 4:16-CV-3049, 2018 WL 582461, at *1 (D. Neb. Jan. 28, 2018). Absent a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling, or absent new facts or legal authority, which the movant was unable to present with reasonable diligence in the first instance, a motion to reconsider will be denied. Zhai, 2018 WL 582461, at *1 (citing Activision TV, Inc. v. Bruning, 8:13-CV-215, 2014 WL 1350278, at 1 (D. Neb. Apr. 4, 2014)).

The defendants have not presented any new evidence or legal authority in support of their motion. Nor have the defendants pointed to any manifest error in the Court's previous order. The defendants merely reargue that which the Court has already considered. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED:

- 1. Defendants' motion for partial reconsideration (filing 57) is denied.
- 2. Defendants' motion for oral argument (filing 67) is denied.

Dated this 4th day of February, 2019.

BY THE COURT:

ohn M. Gerrard

Ohief United States District Judge

¹ Manifest error concerns a wholesale disregard, misapplication or failure to recognize controlling precedent on the part of the court. *Alien Tech. Corp. v. Intermec, Inc.*, 3:06-CV-51, 2010 WL 5174482, at *3 (D.N.D. Dec. 15, 2010).